

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
August 28, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on August 28, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Simulation of Economic-Fiscal Model
Attachment 5	Resource Action Matrix – Lake Oroville Geographic Area
Attachment 6	Resource Action – Tally Sheet
Attachment 7	Summary of July 31, 2003 Straw Poll - Resource Action Review and Prioritization
Attachment 8	Addendum to Resource Action Matrix (Additions/Revisions Only)

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting; several people participated via teleconference. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

Action Items – July 31, 2003 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the July 31, 2003 RSWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #R76:	Report back to the RSWG on the trails planning effort.
Status:	Pete Dangermond (Dangermond Associates) provided an update on the ongoing trails planning effort related to a proposed trails resource action. A trails meeting was held after the last RSWG meeting, and approximately half the required tasks for a trails “plan” were completed. The trails group started with the previous document prepared by Dangermond Associates for the JPA and compared it to the resource actions included in the current version of the resource action matrix. The trails group will hold a subsequent meeting to prioritize trails-related proposals and to address any unresolved issues. The results of the trails group efforts will be presented to the JPA for approval. There will be a follow-up report back to the RSWG at the September 2003 meeting.
Action Item #R77:	Determine how much and what information is needed for the evaluation of potential resource actions.
Status:	There have been no formal guidelines established regarding the type or amount of information needed for the evaluation of potential resource actions. In general, the more information that is available the more thorough the environmental analysis will be. Some resource actions still need resource action information forms completed and others have information missing on the form. The resource action information forms represent the minimum information needed for environmental review.

Resource actions are expected to begin moving to the Plenary Group and the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) Team by the end of September 2003.

- Action Item #R78:** Divide resource actions pertaining to the Lake Oroville geographic area into sub-areas and re-distribute to the RSWG with map and/or description.
- Status: This action item was completed by DWR and was distributed to the RSWG via e-mail. Prioritization of resource actions in the Lake Oroville geographic area took place during the discussion on resource action development later in the meeting (see discussion below).
- Action Item #R79:** Send tally on resource actions priority identification process (from July RSWG meeting) to requesting parties. Distribute revised resource action matrix to RSWG.
- Status: The tally on resource actions from the July 2003 RSWG meeting was distributed to those people who had requested it. The RSWG was also informed that the local newspaper published a survey on proposed resource actions for the local community to complete. Results of the survey were provided to DWR and the newspaper is expected to summarize and published the results in an upcoming edition of the newspaper.
- Action Item #R80:** Consolidate resource action matrix by identifying redundancies and similarities and re-directing resource actions that are not applicable to the RSWG. Consider moving language from non-prioritized resource actions to complimentary ones. First cut at organizing the potential resource actions into four categories (recommended by Plenary Group) for PDEA.
- Status: This action item was not completed. Doug Rischbieter, Recreation and Socioeconomics Resource Area Manager (DWR), indicated that the categories approved by the Plenary Group for the prioritization of resource actions is not suitable for the RSWG's resource actions. The RSWG can select different categories if desired but such selection should be accomplished in the RSWG setting. Combining resource actions where appropriate remains a future action item.

Technical Review Team Update

Tom Wegge with TCW Economics provided an update on recent activities undertaken by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Technical Review Team (TRT). Tom reminded the RSWG that the TRT was established to provide technical oversight to studies R18 and R19, and has also been tasked with overseeing the development of the recreation use models as part of SP-R12.

Tom provided an overview of a more in-depth demonstration of the economic-fiscal impact model that was given at the August TRT meeting. The model is designed to evaluate economic and fiscal impacts associated with current and future operational and recreation visitation scenarios, which will be defined in part by proposed resource actions. The demonstration, intended to show the capabilities of the model rather than to estimate actual economic impacts, included hypothetical scenarios and modeling results distributed to the RSWG (see Attachment 4). It was noted that the model is currently being refined and is not complete. Ultimately, the expenditure data collected as part of the recreation surveys will be used to develop expenditure profiles that will serve as an input to the model. The fiscal component of the model is being refined to allow for a more comprehensive analysis of fiscal impacts. Jon Ebeling, consultant to Butte County on the economic studies, suggested that the fiscal model should account for endogenous population growth. Another RSWG participant asked how lake levels would be accounted for in the model. Tom responded that lake levels would be integrated in the economic-fiscal model through the recreation visitation model, which uses lake levels as a predictor of future recreation use and thus indirectly predicts associated expenditure levels under varying lake level conditions.

Tom also provided an overview of the recreation visitation model, which has been refined based on comments from the TRT. This model uses historical attendance levels at lake Oroville since 1974

but it does not account for capacity issues (i.e., visitors being turned away) because those visitors are not accounted for in the historical data. It was suggested that proposed facilities in the project area would translate into higher recreation use and associated economic activity, although the model does not account for this relationship.

Resource Action Discussion

The resource action discussion began with the prioritization of proposed resource actions in the Lake Oroville geographic area. Doug Rischbieter distributed updated matrix pages that organize the "Lake Oroville" geographic area into four sub-areas: (1) near-town, (2) northwest, (3) east side, and (4) lake-wide (see Attachment 5). The RSWG was instructed to select their three highest-priority resource actions from each of the four sub-areas, the results of which will be integrated with the prioritization process that occurred at the last RSWG meeting. The participants' preferred resource actions for the Lake Oroville area were recorded during the meeting.

RSWG participants provided input on the process during the tallying process. One participant asked that the matrix include the sponsor of the resource action; this can be accomplished for all resource actions with an associated resource action information form. Another participant was concerned that if individual resource actions represent pieces of a larger resource action, the larger action should be analyzed otherwise the individual action may not be cost-effective to implement and be dismissed. DWR acknowledged that there is still work to be done to further consolidate the resource actions and look for synergies that exist between actions.

Two handouts were distributed that summarized the results from the prioritization process that occurred at the July 2003 RSWG meeting. The first handout is a tally sheet that summarized the results from last month's meeting (see Attachment 6). Some resource actions received no votes even though a resource action information form has been completed, and conversely, many resource actions that received a number of votes do not have a completed form. Eventually, a resource action information form will need to be filled out for those proposals that move forward to the Plenary Group and the PDEA Team for further analysis. The second handout provides the results of the tallying process in chart format (see Attachment 7).

DWR distributed an addendum to the Resource Action Matrix (distributed at the July 31 RSWG meeting) showing what has changed (e.g., new resource actions, modified text) in the last month (see Attachment 8); a full version of the matrix is available upon request. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) submitted forms for many existing and several new resource actions; the latter are included in Attachment 8.

The RSWG discussed how the proposed resource actions would be sorted and prioritized and ultimately moved forward to the PDEA Team. There has been no official guidance on how to sort and prioritize resource actions, and at this point, all resource actions are being treated the same, with no proposals being eliminated from consideration. Doug suggested that DWR and the consulting team will take the tallying results from tonight's meeting and merge them with the existing data, add a new column to the matrix to represent the results of the newspaper survey, and evaluate the resource actions to identify redundancies and opportunities for combining resource actions where appropriate. The revised matrix will be organized by geographic area, with tally results sorted by these areas.

Doug explained that the tallying or prioritization process would serve as a tool that DWR will use to narrow down the list of resource actions for future analysis. However, the tallying process will not entirely dictate what moves forward in the process; in other words, resource actions that have received no votes may still move forward, while DWR still has the authority to not move forward those proposals that received multiple votes.

The RSWG discussed how to package the approximately 220 resource actions for review. Options include organizing the proposals by geographic region or by recreation type, and ultimately organizing the resource actions into project alternatives. A question was raised regarding how this process will interface with the Recreation Plan that is being developed by DWR and the Needs Analysis that is being completed by the Consultant Team. Doug Rischbieter responded that the draft Needs Analysis will be completed by the end of 2003 and the final Needs Analysis completed during the first quarter 2004. It was also clarified that the process to revise the General Plan for the LOSRA will soon begin and will make extensive use of the information and data generated from the relicensing process. The RSWG will have the opportunity to review and provide input on the Needs Analysis through the standard review protocol for study plan reports.

The RSWG also discussed how to combine resource actions. There is a concern with lumping small projects with bigger projects because it tends to narrow options for various combinations of resource actions and larger more complex actions with multiple components may not be financially feasible. Therefore, DWR would prefer that resource actions be evaluated individually to the extent practical. The RSWG discussed the concept of “achievable first phase”, where large (multiple component) projects are phased in over time with focus on the components that are feasible in the near term; this concept is consistent with FERC’s phasing provisions.

The Facilitator informed the RSWG that the Plenary Group is expecting to begin reviewing proposed resource actions from each of the work groups beginning next month. One participant asked whether the submitted resource action information forms are available for public review. Doug responded that currently the forms are not publicly available. The RSWG discussed the need for DWR and the PDEA Team to understand where exactly the resource action is located for proper planning and environmental review and concluded that maps showing the locations of resource actions would be helpful for further discussions. DWR agreed to bring large maps to the next RSWG meeting.

Next Steps

The RSWG discussed the priority of resource action development over study results and suggested that reports on study plan results be brief and scheduled at the end of meeting agendas. The RSWG also discussed the potential need for more or longer meetings but were not willing to begin holding all-day meetings. They did agree to begin earlier in September. The Facilitator reported that the Kelly Ridge location was already booked and is unavailable for their September date so the location will be determined and RSWG participants notified on the meeting announcement. The RSWG agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, September 25, 2003
Time: 5:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Oroville (venue to be determined)

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the RSWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R76: Report back to the RSWG on the trails planning effort (*Follow-Up Action Item*).

Responsible: Dangermond Group (JPA)

Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R80: Consolidate resource action matrix by identifying redundancies and similarities and re-directing resource actions that are not applicable to the

RSWG. Consider moving language from non-prioritized resource actions to complimentary ones. (*Follow-Up Action Item*)

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R81: Use information from newspaper survey to augment Work group survey tally and organize matrix and tally results by geographic area.

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R82: Develop key discussion bullets for each geographic area including 1) Existing uses, 2) Future/proposed uses/needs, 3) “focus” for the area, 4) location of actions, 5) additions for improvement of existing facilities, etc.

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R83: Provide maps showing geographic areas to determine locations of resource actions at next RSWG meeting.

Responsible: DWR
Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R84: Identify priority resource actions for the JPA.

Responsible: Pete Dangermond (Dangermond Associates)
Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R85: Seek approval on JPA trails plan from JPA.

Responsible: Pete Dangermond (Dangermond Associates)
Due Date: September 25, 2003

Action Item #R86: Ask DPR to report information about needs on east side of Lake.

Responsible: DPR
Due Date: September 25, 2003